



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/927,496	08/13/2001	Jung-Wan Ko	1293.1059CIP2D4	7491

49455 7590 03/23/2007  
STEIN, MCEWEN & BUI, LLP  
1400 EYE STREET, NW  
SUITE 300  
WASHINGTON, DC 20005

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, HUY THANH

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2621

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	03/23/2007	PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

09/927,496

Applicant(s)

KO ET AL.

Examiner

HUY T. NGUYEN

Art Unit

2621

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 December 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 and 18-26 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 and 18-26 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)          | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)          | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

**DETAILED ACTION*****Double Patenting***

1. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

2. Claim 1-11 and 22- 26 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1 and 3-7 of U.S. Patent No. 7,184,651.

Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the difference between claim 1-11 and 22-26 of the present application and claims 1, 3-5 of U.S. Patent No. 7,184,651 is that claim 1 and 3-5 of U.S. Patent No. 7,184,651 further includes title catalog information that is not found in claims 1, 22 and 26 of the present application. Since features of claims 1 and 3-7 of U.S. Patent No. 7,184,651 encompass the features of claims 1-11 and 22-26 of the

present application , it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify and edit claims 1 and 3-7 of U.S. Patent No. 7,184,651 to produce claims 1-11 and 22-26 of the present application .

3. Claim 1-11 and 22-26 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1, 7-8 and 17-19 of U.S. Patent No. 7,167,636.

Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the difference between claims 1 –11 and 22-26 of the present application and claims 1 ,7-8 and 17-18 of U.S. Patent No. 7,167,636 is that claim 1 and 7-8 of U.S. Patent No. 7,167,636 further includes title catalog information that is not found in claims 1,22 and 26 of the present application . Since features of claims 1,7-8 and 17-18 of U.S. Patent No. 7,167,636 encompass the features of claims 1-11 and 22-26 of the present application , it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify and edit claims 1,7-8 and 17-18 of U.S. Patent No. 7,167,636 to produce claims 1-11 and 22-26 of the present application .

4. Claims 12-16 and 18-21 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 12,20 and 13-18 and 20 of U.S. Patent No. 6,810,201.

Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the difference between claims 12-16 and 18-21 of the present application and claims 12,20 and 13-18 of U.S. Patent No. 6,810,201 is that claims 12 and 20 of U.S. Patent No. 6,810,201 are apparatus claims and claims 12 of

Art Unit: 2621

the present application is a method claim . Since the method claim 12 of the present application performs a method that corresponds to apparatus claims 12 and 20 of U.S. Patent No. 6,810,201 , it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify claims 12,20 and 13-18 of U.S. Patent No. 6,810,201 by using the apparatus of claims 12,20 and 13-18 of U.S. Patent No. 6,810,201 to produce the method claims 12-16 and 18-21 of the present application.

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to HUY T. NGUYEN whose telephone number is (571) 272-7378. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30AM -6:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, James Groody can be reached on (571) 272-7950. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

HUY NGUYEN  
PRIMARY EXAMINER